## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Through the above amendments, claims 1, 3-11, and 13-19 remain pending in this application. Restricted claims 20-33 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to incorporate the respective limitations of claims 2 and 12 which claims were in turn cancelled as duplicative. The dependencies of claims 3 and 13 were changed accordingly.

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claims 3 and 13 contain allowable subject matter. All of the other pending claims stand rejected over Moon et al. Claims 2 and 12 were indicated as anticipated by Moon et al. so that this is the rejection addressed below with respect to amended claims 1 and 11.

Allowable claims 3 and 13 define specific default limits on peer-to-peer communications within a WTRU which are subject to be overridden by network communications. This provides network control over the WTRU's peer-to-peer communications capabilities.

Independent claims 1 and 11 as amended define a generalized version of this type of network control over the WTRU's peer-to-peer communications, but claims 1 and 11 do not define the specific type of defaults that the network overrides. For example, claim 1 now defines the WTRU as "configured with selected default control limits for peer-to-peer mode communications that can be overridden based on

communication signals received in infrastructure communications with a network base station."

The Examiner cites column 14, lines 41-56 of Moon et al. as teaching this feature. That passage simply states that one may select any desired parameters with which the WTRU will operate to control its peer-to-peer communications. Moon et al. does not teach whether such parameters are to be configured as defaults or otherwise.

Moreover, at column 15 lines 6-10, Moon et al. specifically teaches that it is the WTRU itself making the decision with respect to peer-to-peer communications.

> Finally, although the link quality of the base station link with first mobile station 20 may be strong, **mobile station 20 may determine** the existence of a Bluetooth connection with second mobile station 20 due to the movement of the mobile stations 20 within proximity of one another. Based on a path length metric (or any other appropriate metric or metrics), first mobile station 20 may determine that the call should be routed directly to the second mobile station 20 using the Bluetooth link.

There is no disclosure or suggestion in Moon et al. of having the ability to have a network override the WRTU's default control of its own peer-to-peer communications. Accordingly, Moon et al does not anticipate amended claims 1 and 11.

Based on the arguments presented above, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4-11 and 14-19 is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephone interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including claims 1, 3-11 and 13-19, is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Reddy et al.

By_____
C. Frederick Koenig III
Registration No. 29,662

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

CFK/djw